

REMARKS

Claims 1-66 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 25, 34, 41, 46-51, 53, 55, 57-63, 65, and 66 are amended above. Claim 42 is cancelled above. No new matter is added by the claim amendments. Entry is respectfully requested.

Claims 29, 30, 42, and 66 stand objected to for reasons stated in the Office Action. The claims are amended above in a manner consistent with suggestions provided in the Office Action. Specifically, claim 66 has been amended to depend from claim 65. Further, claim 42 has been canceled from the claims. Entry of the amendments and removal of the objection are respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 29, 54 and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. With regard to this rejection, reference is made to the hinge 164 illustrated at FIG. 11 and described in the corresponding text of the specification as filed at page 12, lines 1-6. The hinge 164 allows for the head interface 40 and the grip handle 38 to be positioned relative to each other at a range of angles. It is therefore submitted that the specification is enabling with regard to this limitation. Removal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-11, 20, 34-39, 41, 43, 46-50, 57-62, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

With regard to the rejection of claims 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, claim 6 is amended above to clarify that the partition mount further comprises "a head" that is constructed and arranged for coupling to the "head interface". It should now be clear that claim 6 is directed to a "partition mount" that further includes "a head", as stated. Claims 7-10 are dependent on claim 6 and further define the head.

With regard to the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it is submitted that this claim is clearly directed to "a partition mount" that includes a head interface

that is "integral" with the mount body.

With regard to the rejection of claims 34-38 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, claim 34 is amended above to clarify that the partition mount further comprises "a head" that is constructed and arranged for coupling to the "head interface". It should now be clear that claim 34 is directed to a "partition mount" that further includes "a head", as stated. Claims 35-38 are dependent on claim 34 and further define the head.

With regard to the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it is submitted that this claim is clearly directed to "a partition mount" that includes a head interface that is "integral" with the mount body.

With regard to the rejection of claim 41 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, it is submitted that this claim is clearly directed to "a partition mount" that includes a "head" that is "integral" with the "head interface".

With regard to the rejection of claim 46 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the claim is amended above to clarify that the partition mount further comprises "an elongated head". It should now be clear that claim 46 is directed to a "partition mount" that includes "a head", as stated. Claims 47-50 are dependent on claim 46 and further define the head.

With regard to the rejection of claim 57 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the claim is amended above to clarify that the partition mount further comprises "an elongated head". It should now be clear that claim 57 is directed to a "partition mount" that includes "a head", as stated. Claims 58-61 are dependent on claim 46 and further define the head.

With regard to the rejection of claim 62 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, the claim is amended above to clarify that the partition mount further comprises "an elongated head". It should now be clear that claim 62 is directed to a "partition mount" that includes "a head", as

stated.

In view of the above, reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 6-11, 34-39, 41, 46-50, and 57-62 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 20, 43, and 64, it is submitted that both an inwardly biased spring and an outwardly biased spring can be used to outwardly bias the pole interface and head interface. For example, in the configuration illustrated in FIGs. 1, 2, and 3 of the present specification, an outwardly biased spring 44 is used to outwardly bias the pole interface 34 and head interface 40. Conversely, in the example provided in FIG. 9, an inwardly biased spring 44 is used to outwardly bias the pole interface 134 and head interface 40. In view of the above, reconsideration and removal of the rejection of claims 20, 43, and 64 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 14, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 32, 42, 43, 55, 56, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bartys (US Patent No. 5,832,652). Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14, 17-20, 22-25, 28-31, 33-39, 41-43, 45-50, 53-64, and 66 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Walker (US Patent No. 5,715,620). Claims 1-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24-27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 51, 52, 55, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lassiter (US Patent No. 6,523,231). Claims 1-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24-27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 51, 52, 55, 63, and 64 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Pencek (US Patent No. 2,487,585). Claims 16, 23, 24, 27, 45, 52, 56, and 65 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pencek in view of Stammers (US Patent No. 5,918,843). Reconsideration of the rejection and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested.

In the present invention as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 46, 51, 53, 55, 57, 62, and 63, a "pole interface" is provided that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole".

In the present invention as claimed in independent claim 65, a "pole interface" is provided that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut a perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole".

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, 14, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30, 32, 42, 43, 55, 56, 63, and 64 as being anticipated by Bartys, Bartys is directed to a clip-on tip up device for use as an indicator. It is submitted that Bartys fails to teach or suggest a "pole interface" that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole" as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 55, and 63. Instead, in Bartys, the arm 12 is fixedly secured to handle 30, and is therefore not removably secured. In addition, Bartys teaches mounting the handle to an end portion of the arm, and not a side portion of the arm. Further, Bartys fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is "operative through the pole interface and the head interface to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface", as claimed in claim 1, 25, 53, and 63. No such feature is taught or suggested by Bartys. Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, independent claims 1, 25, 55, and 63, and claims 2, 4, 14, 19, 20, 22, 23, 30, 32, 42, 43, 56, and 64 dependent thereon, are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-3, 5-11, 14, 17-20, 22-25, 28-31, 33-39, 41-43, 45-50, 53-64, and 66 as being anticipated by Walker, Walker is directed to a mechanized animated display for an automobile. It is submitted that Walker fails to teach or suggest a "pole interface" that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole" as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 46, 53, 55, 62 and 63. Instead, in Walker, attachment arm 44 is configured to extend through an aperture 48, 50 formed in the handle 22. Therefore, Walker does not teach or suggest a "pole interface" that "abuts ... exclusively an external region of a pole" as claimed in claims 1, 25, 46, 53, 55, 62 and 63. Further, Walker fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is "operative through the pole interface and the head interface [or head] to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface", as claimed in claims 1, 25, 46, 53, 55, 62,

and 63. No such feature is taught or suggested by Walker. Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, independent claims 1, 25, 46, 53, 55, 62, and 63 and claims 2, 3, 5-11, 14, 17-20, 22-24, 28-31, 33-39, 41-43, 45, 47-50, 54, 56-61, and 64 dependent thereon, are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24-27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 51, 52, 55, 63, and 64 as being anticipated by Lassiter, Lassiter is directed to a power extension cord clip. It is submitted that Lassiter fails to teach or suggest a "pole interface" that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole", as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63. Instead, in Lassiter, the sleeve comprising elements 34, 22 and 14a is closed and is configured to abut an entire perimeter of an electric cord contained therein. In addition, when clamped the Lassiter sleeve comprising elements 34, 22, and 14a is fixedly secured to the inserted electric cord and is therefore not removably secured. Further, Lassiter fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is "operative through the pole interface and the head interface to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface", as claimed in claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63. No such feature is taught or suggested by Lassiter. Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, independent claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63, and claims 2-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 52 and 64 dependent thereon, are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24-27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 51, 52, 55, 63, and 64 as being anticipated by Pencek, Pencek is directed to a cord holder for an ironing board. It is submitted that Pencek fails to teach or suggest a "pole interface" that is "constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole" as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63. Instead, in Pencek, the cylindrical portion of unit 5 that engages screw 7 abuts an entire perimeter of the screw. In addition, in Pencek, the cylindrical portion of unit 5 that engages screw 7 is fixedly secured to the screw and is therefore not removably secured. Further, Pencek fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is "operative through the pole interface and the head interface

to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface”, as claimed in claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63. No such feature is taught or suggested by Pencek.

Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, independent claims 1, 25, 51, 55, and 63, and claims 2-4, 14-16, 19, 20, 22, 24, 26, 27, 30-32, 42, 43, 45, 52 and 64 dependent thereon, are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claims 16, 23, 24, 27, 45, 52, and 56 as being unpatentable over Pencek in view of Stammers, Stammers is directed to a scaffold bracket. Like Pencek, Stammers fails to teach or suggest a “pole interface” that is “constructed and arranged to removably abut less than an entire perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole” as claimed in independent claims 1, 25, 51, and 55. Further, Stammers fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is “operative through the pole interface and the head interface to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface”, as claimed in claims 1, 25, 51, and 55. No such feature is taught or suggested by Stammers. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Pencek and Stammers fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 16, 23, 24, 27, 45, 52, and 56. Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, claims 16, 23, 24, 27, 45, 52, and 56 are respectfully requested.

With regard to the rejection of claim 65 as being unpatentable over Pencek in view of Stammers, Pencek fails to teach or suggest a “pole interface” that is “constructed and arranged to removably abut a perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole” as claimed in independent claim 65. Instead, in Pencek, the cylindrical portion of unit 5 that engages screw 7 is fixedly secured to the screw and is therefore not removably secured. Further, Pencek fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is “operative through the pole interface and the head interface to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface”, as claimed in claim 65. Like Pencek, Stammers fails to teach or suggest a “pole interface” that is “constructed and arranged to removably abut a perimeter of a side portion of exclusively an external region of a pole” as claimed in independent claim 65. Further, Stammers fails to teach or suggest a biasing unit that is “operative through the pole interface and the head

interface to suspend the partition mount in position between the pole and the abutting surface", as claimed in claim 65. No such feature is taught or suggested by Stammers. Accordingly, it is submitted that the combination of Pencek and Stammers fails to teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claim 65. Reconsideration of the rejection of, and allowance of, claim 65 are respectfully requested.

Closing Remarks

It is submitted that all claims are in condition for allowance, and such allowance is respectfully requested. If prosecution of the application can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 15, 2005
Mills & Onello, LLP
Eleven Beacon Street, Suite 605
Boston, MA 02108
Telephone: (617) 994-4900, Ext. 4902
Facsimile: (617) 742-7774
J:\ZIP\007\amendmentb.wpd

Anthony P. Onello, Jr.
Anthony P. Onello, Jr.
Registration Number 38,572
Attorney for Applicant